

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

Shaun A. Bryant, :  
Plaintiff, : Case No. 2:16-cv-1190  
v. :  
Major Perry, et al., : CHIEF JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.  
Magistrate Judge Kemp  
Defendant. :

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Shaun A. Bryant was a state prisoner housed at the Franklin County Corrections Center when he filed his complaint on December 21, 2016. By order dated January 6, 2017, the Court directed Mr. Bryant to submit, within 30 days of the date of that order, a certified account statement from the prison cashier which indicated both the average monthly balance in his account for the last six months and the amount of income credited to his account during those months. Mr. Bryant has not submitted the statement.

Under this circumstance, the Court recommends that Mr. Bryant be assessed the full filing fee. McGore v. Wigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199 (2007). The Court further recommends that this case be dismissed for want of prosecution if Mr. Bryant does not pay the full fee within thirty days.

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen days of the date of this Report, file and serve on all parties written objections to those specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made, together with supporting authority for the objection(s). A judge

of this Court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. Upon proper objections, a judge of this Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made herein, may receive further evidence or may recommit this matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to have the district judge review the Report and Recommendation de novo, and also operates as a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the Report and Recommendation. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

/s/ Terence P. Kemp  
United States Magistrate Judge